

on the moon. Or a single leader as riveting as Jack Kennedy. But we have a task that is at least as important.

Our mission, it seems to me, is contained in a word that underpins everything I've said here today, a word that I used right at the start of this talk: competitiveness.

We must be competitive. We must find, develop, encourage . . . train the leaders who will adapt and adopt that mission.

Who will use all their skills to manage the chaos. Who will put North American business "on the moon."

Thank you.

The Rapidly Changing World

THE GIFTS OF HUMAN FREEDOM

By MAX M. KAMPELMAN, Attorney and Formerly in Charge of U.S.-U.S.S.R. Arms Control Negotiation

The Yehuda Hellman Memorial Lecture, Delivered to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, New York City, New York, June 14, 1989

THE name of Yehuda Hellman is associated with the noblest of Jewish values and commitments. It is an honor to have been invited by you to deliver a lecture in his memory.

It has been less than five months since I left government service with its different, exciting and enriching challenges. My appearance before you this afternoon, representing as you do the established leadership of the American Jewish community, provides me with the opportunity to stand back and evaluate the dramatic world changes I have had the privilege of observing and experiencing.

The fundamental fact is that the world is changing so fast and so dramatically that we can barely see its details let alone its scope. The changes are beyond calculation, probably greater than have taken place in all of mankind's previous history combined, with newer, greater scientific and technological developments on the horizon that will probably make the discoveries of our time dwarf by comparison. Indeed, for the first time in human history, mankind is rapidly altering the basic physiology of our planet. The chemical composition of the atmosphere is being altered, as is the genetic diversity of species inhabiting the planet. Moreover, we are cycling vital chemicals through the oceans, atmosphere, biosphere and geosphere at an unprecedented scale without fully understanding their consequences.

During my lifetime, medical knowledge available to physicians has increased conservatively more than ten-fold. I am told that more than 80 percent of all scientists who ever lived are alive today. The average life span is now nearly twice as great as it was when my grandparents were born. The average world standard of living has, by one estimate, quadrupled in the past century. Advanced computers, new materials, new bio-technological processes are altering every phase of our lives, deaths, even reproduction. These developments are stretching our minds and our grasp of reality to the outermost dimensions of our capacity to understand them. Moreover, as we look ahead, we must agree that we have only the minutest glimpse of what our universe really is. Our science is indeed a drop, our ignorance a sea.

We are brought up to believe that necessity is the mother of invention. I suggest the corollary is also true: invention is the mother of necessity. Technology and communication have made the world smaller. There is no escaping the fact that the sound of a whisper or a whimper in one part of the world can immediately be heard in all parts of the world — we have seen ample evidence of that in the Middle East. And yet the world

body politic is not keeping pace with those realities.

What we have instead been observing is an intense fractionalization, as large numbers of people have had their emotions inflamed by nationality and religious appeals. It is as if a part of us is saying: "Not so fast. Stop the world. We want to get off. We are not ready. We are not prepared for this new world we are being dragged into. We will resist the pressures by holding on tight and with a determined frenzy to the familiar, the tribal, the traditional!"

But the inevitable tomorrow is appearing. Developments in science and technology are fundamentally altering our material lives; and our social and political relationships as well. There are new dominant sounds and among those most clearly and loudly heard are the sounds of freedom and democracy. The striving for human dignity is universal because it is an integral part of our human character. We see it in China, Burma, Korea, the Philippines, South Africa, Chile, Paraguay, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland — different cultures, different parts of the world. A larger part of the world's population is today living in relative freedom than ever before in the history of the world.

This development is of special significance to those of us who try to carry forward the values of our Jewish traditions so that we may have the right to be called "The People of the Book." If there is any meaning to the term "chosen people" and if there is any justification for the inexplicable survival of the Jewish people over the ages, when they could have been just a footnote in the pages of history, it must be in our identification with the lessons and values of the Book. The ancient Hebrew tribes made their historic contribution to civilization by proclaiming to their neighbors that there was only one God. The immense significance of that insight was in the concept that if there is only one God, then all of us are His children and, thus, brothers and sisters to one another. Thus, the Talmud question: "Why did God create only one man?" And the response: in order that all men would have the same ancestor, and no man could claim superiority over another.

Democracy is the political expression of that religious ethic. The notion that human beings are the children of God and that they thus have the potential for developing that which is God-like within them is clearly anathema to any political system which does not respect the human being. The development of democracy as a political philosophy and system of governance was an inevitable outgrowth of the belief in the integrity of the human being.

There is one other related ingredient of religious belief. It is that the human being is not only capable of reaching God-like dimensions through the process of growth, experience, performance and faith, but that there is also a baser and lesser part of the human being. The ancient Jewish Rabbis referred to that in the soul which was good and that in the soul which was evil, "Yaitzer Hatov" and "Yaitzer Harah." Reinhold Niebuhr, the great Christian theologian, called it "Children of Light and Children of Darkness." We have here as well the root of modern psychiatry. This dichotomy in the human being is understandably also found in the societies which the human being creates. Thus, just as democracy is the political expression of the religious notion of human brotherhood, so is dictatorship an expression of the destructive side of us. This explains the horrors of the Nazi phenomenon, as well as the brutalities of the Soviet system.

Throughout the ages, forces have arisen determined to resist and turn back the forward movement of civilization. But history has demonstrated that the power of Man to stretch himself into a more God-like form of self cannot be permanently denied. Thus, the importance of the biblical assertion that Man was made in the image of God. Within every age the drive for human liberty and dignity is dominant. Hannah Arendt came to understand this human ingredient when she wrote in her 1958 epilogue to her *Origins of Totalitarianism* that the new voices from Eastern Europe "speaking so plainly and simply of freedom and truth, sounded like an ultimate affirmation that human nature is unchangeable, that Communism will be futile, that even in the absence of all teaching and in the presence of overwhelming indoctrination, a yearning for freedom and truth will rise out of man's heart and mind forever."

The trend toward freedom and democracy is prompted not only by a deep inner drive for human dignity, but by the growing realization that democracy works best. Governments and societies everywhere are discovering that keeping up with change requires openness to information, new ideas, and the freedom which enables ingenuity to germinate and flourish. State-controlled centralized planning cannot keep up with the pace of change. A closed tightly-controlled society cannot compete in a world experiencing an information explosion that knows no national boundaries.

We are in a time when no society can isolate itself or its people from new ideas and new information anymore than one can escape the winds whose currents affect us all. National boundaries can keep out vaccines, but those boundaries cannot keep out germs or ideas or broadcasts. This suggests the need to reappraise our traditional definitions of sovereignty. The Government of Bangladesh, for example, cannot prevent tragic floods without active cooperation from Nepal and India. Canada cannot protect its water from acid rain without collaborating with the United States. The Mediterranean is polluted by 18 different countries. One essential geo-political consequence of this new reality is that there can be no true security for any one country in isolation. Unilateral security will not come from either withdrawing from the world or attempting national impregnability. Instead, we must learn to accept in each of our countries a mutual responsibility for the peoples in other countries.

In this world of increasing interdependence, the lessons for the United States and the Soviet Union — the most important security relationship in the present era — are evident. On a smaller scale, the lessons for Israel and its Arab neighbors are

also becoming increasingly evident. We cannot escape from one another. We are bound together in an equation that makes the security of each of us dependent on that of the other. We must try to learn to live together.

We are told by Soviet leaders that through the process of internal transformation that is demanded by the new technologies, they comprehend that repressive societies in our day cannot achieve inner stability or true security; that it is in their best interest to permit a humanizing process to take place; and that their domestic requirements are their highest priority.

Without doubt, that leadership faces the urgent need for drastic internal changes if the Soviet Union is to be a significant part of the 21st Century. The Soviet economy is working poorly, although it does provide a fully functioning military machine. Massive military power has provided the Soviets with a presence that reaches all parts of the world, but this military superpower cannot hide the fact that its economic and social weaknesses are deep. The Soviet's awesome internal police force has provided continuity to its system of governance, but a Russia which during Czarist days exported food cannot today feed its own people. Productivity is low. With absenteeism, corruption, and alcoholism, internal morale is bad. The new leaders of the Soviet Union are fully aware of its problems. They are also aware of our strengths, reflecting the vitality of our values and the healthy dynamism of our system.

We hear the Soviet words with hope that the deeds and reality will indeed follow the rhetoric. We hope the time is at hand when Soviet authorities, looking at the energy of the West, comprehend the systemic weakness that corrodes their society. We hope Soviet leadership today realizes that its historic aim of achieving Communism through violence has no place in this nuclear age. We hope Soviet authorities will join us in making the commitment that our survival as a civilization depends on the mutual realization that we must live under rules of responsible international behavior. We hope — and there are encouraging signs to bolster that hope. But as yet, we, regrettably, cannot trust.

But even as we cannot yet trust, we have a responsibility to observe developments in the Soviet Union carefully and to do so with open eyes and an open mind. It will not be easy for many of us to change the prism of our accustomed spectacles for clearer viewing. President Gorbachev has shown himself in a dramatic way willing to reconsider past views. The words *glasnost* and *perestroika* have been repeated so extensively that the ideas they represent may well take on a meaning and dynamism of their own which could become internally irreversible. We must contribute to that process.

When I began negotiating with the Soviet Union in 1980, under President Carter, human rights was beginning to be injected as a major item of our country's international agenda. The Soviet Union insisted that the discussion of the subject was an improper interference in their internal affairs. When President Reagan asked me in 1985 to return to government service as head of our nuclear arms reduction negotiating team, an extraordinary change soon became apparent. Under the leadership of the President, the United States enlarged upon what President Carter initiated, and incorporated the concept of human rights as a necessary and ever-present ingredient in the totality of our relations with the Soviet Union.

In his 1975 Nobel Prize speech that he was not permitted to present in person, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, said:

"I am convinced that international trust, mutual understanding, disarmament, and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish, and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

The United States interacts and negotiates with the Soviet Union in that context. We have faith in our principles as we intensify our efforts, through our negotiations, to find a basis for understanding, security, stability, and peace with dignity.

To negotiate is risky. It is, in the words of my dear friend, Hubert Humphrey, something like crossing a river while walking on slippery rocks. The possibility of disaster is on every side, but it is the way — sometimes the only way — to get across. The object of our diplomacy and the supreme achievement of statesmanship is patiently, through negotiation, to pursue the peace with dignity we seek, always recognizing the threat to that peace, and always protecting our vital national interests and values. I respectfully suggest to you that the same principle is applicable to Israel as it searches for a context within which to pursue the peace with dignity that it seeks for itself and its neighbors.

The United States and the Soviet Union have begun a historic process. We are still much nearer to the beginning than to the end of that process. The process, furthermore, is likely to be a difficult and murky one. The fundamental nature of the Soviet system is the reality that they and we must still face. Their problems are real and overwhelming. Ethnic nationalism at times appears to be tearing at the fiber of the Soviet empire. There is violence, demonstrations, curfews, and the recurring question: "How tolerant can Moscow afford to be?" Can the Soviet Union, with more than 100 nationalities and widely disparate cultures living in 15 Republics, contain the demands for local sovereignty?

Just as the strains must not blind us to the changes, so should the changes not blind us to the difficulties that still remain. Yes, the changes are stunning — Soviet troops out of Afghanistan; Solidarity legally recognized in Poland and permitted to declare electoral victory; the prospect of Cuban troop withdrawal from Angola; Vietnam's agreement to withdraw from Cambodia; Communist Party officials challenged and defeated in Soviet elections; the beginning of a two party system in Hungary; interesting Soviet proposals to reduce conventional arms along lines proposed by the West.

But, of course, the basis for skepticism also remains as we look at Cuba, Soviet military assistance to Nicaragua, the awesome Soviet military budget, the Soviet's missile sale to Libya of bomber aircraft capable of threatening and further destabilizing the Middle East. We could go on.

The great challenge to our diplomacy is how to adjust to a rapidly changing Soviet Union in a rapidly changing world without endangering our security and our values. As we do so, we must at the same time be sensitive to the judgment of history and take heed lest future generations condemn us for having missed a decisive opportunity for peace with dignity.

It is understandable, as we consider the dimensions of the East-West changes and challenges, that our minds are drawn to another major seemingly intractable problem — the agonizing tensions between Jew and Arab in the Middle East that cause neighbors to hate and hurt and too often kill one

another, thereby diminishing themselves and their hopes and dreams.

There is no way for the Middle East to escape the movement toward democracy and human dignity that is gripping all parts of the world. It will in time have its impact on Syria and Libya and Saudi Arabia as much as it has its impact on Paraguay and Poland. The American people understand that Israel is today the only democracy in the region. This accounts in no small measure for the deep friendship toward Israel felt by the vast majority of our fellow citizens. This commitment, however, is under siege as Israel is made to appear — sometimes unwittingly and regrettably contributing to that appearance — as unsympathetic toward the human and political aspirations of its Palestinian Arab neighbors.

It is in Israel's best interests for democracy to develop and grow in the area. Societies governed by internal free debate, open discussion and the ballot box are much more likely to seek the resolution of problems through negotiation and compromise than by war and violence. It is no wonder that within Israel, poll after poll shows an overwhelming majority of Israelis from all political persuasions favoring negotiations with the Palestinians and seeking a peaceful solution to the Palestinian problem. There is, therefore, great virtue in the call by the Israeli Government for free elections to select negotiators in the West Bank and Gaza. Other than in Israel itself, Arabs in the area have no opportunity to vote. It is important to press the practice and expand its use.

Yes, there are risks in elections as there are risks in negotiations, but there is strength and virtue in the process as well. Israel must not permit the risk to obfuscate the opportunity. Israel must not lose its identification with the Jewish values of universal human brotherhood, political democracy, a commitment to human dignity for all.

We do not know whether the PLO will permit Palestinians to vote in the Israeli proposed election plan. If the vote takes place, we must assume that a free election in the territories is likely to select Arab negotiators some of whom seek the destruction of Israel, whether or not Arafat talks peace to the Western press. It would then be the task of Israeli diplomats to negotiate and to unmask the charade with the objective of dividing those Arabs who seek a peaceful and realistic solution from those who do not. If the PLO continues to reject elections, or acts to undermine its direction, the onus for failure must then be the PLO's and not Israeli's. In any event, close American-Israeli coordination is indispensable.

A negotiation, if one takes place, requires both a perception and reality of genuineness. The world will demand it and so will our own yearning for peace. The issues are difficult and call for understanding. America must never forget (and Israel can never forget) that the distance from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean is a mere 40 miles. It would be difficult to shoehorn even two friendly states into that narrow area. Americans must also appreciate that the 1967 borders, to which some would have Israel retreat, would leave Israel with a corridor only eight miles wide between Haifa and Tel Aviv, and some three miles wide between Jerusalem and Tel Aviv — clearly inconsistent with the objective of U.N. Security Council Resolution 242 to provide Israel with secure borders. The negotiating task will indeed be a formidable one.

The fact of the matter is that the time is ripe for negotiations no matter how formidable the task. But, we must also

realistically appreciate that the time is far from ripe for solutions to the intractable set of problems under negotiation. A process must begin. Yes, as Secretary of State Baker has urged, Arabs must end their economic boycott of Israel; Arabs should stop challenging Israel's standing in international organizations; the PLO should amend its covenant and end its *Intifada* in favor of diplomacy; the Soviet Union should restore diplomatic ties with Israel and stop destabilizing the area by supplying sophisticated weapons to countries like Libya; Israel should permit West Bank schools to reopen and reach out to the Palestinians as neighbors who deserve political rights; and, yes, in accordance with an underlying principle of UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, still the best and probably the essential framework for peace in the Middle East, in return for a secure peace Israel will have to be willing to withdraw from significant Arab-populated portions of the West Bank and Gaza. These are indeed the ingredients for a dialogue, a negotiation, the beginning of a process.

A recent statement by Prime Minister Shamir defined and refined the issue constructively. At the same time as he reaffirmed Israel's opposition to an independent Palestinian State he said:

" . . . There are many Palestinian Arabs who do not want to live under our rule. We do not ignore it. And, therefore, we are seeking a solution. . . . We are looking for a solution that will satisfy both sides."

It is not my purpose today to set forth a formula for solving the problem of Jewish-Arab tensions in Palestine. We can agree, however, that Israel's security must be assured even as the inevitable Arab self-rule and self-dignity and democratic beginnings come into being. It will also become increasingly clear to all in the area, that its compactness and lack of resources require at least a minimum organic skeleton of economic cooperation if it is to enjoy the benefits of the vastly changing world now emerging with its immense new opportunities and challenges.

The United States can play a crucial role in stimulating and initiating this new process. Its diplomatic role must be based on keeping the respect of all the parties in the region. This will require a diplomacy based on principle, on human values, on loyalty to those who share those principles and values, and on a determination to be faithful to friends. Specifically, we must reaffirm and never put into question the "special relationship" that exists between the U.S. and Israel, one that is real and not merely ritualistic. To question that special relationship will place our credibility as a nation at risk. There can be no sense of detachment or so-called "even-handedness" toward Israel, a friend and fellow democracy in the family of nations. Let others who seek to join this family of democratic friends join us by demonstrating their commitment to the peace with dignity we seek. To those twenty or so Arab states who continue to maintain the state of war against Israel, our friend, we must say, "Earn our friendship by ending your state of war. Join us in a constructive peace process." It is the refusal of the Arab

states, except for Egypt, to recognize the legitimacy of Israel which remains the formidable barrier to the peace process.

The United States must also now assert as a litmus test that we intend persistently to press the United Nations and its member states, including the Soviet Union, to repeal the "Zionism is Racism" resolution. So long as the United Nations has that offensive resolution on its books, it is disqualified from playing any constructive role where Israel, our friend, is concerned.

Alexis de Tocqueville wrote in the nineteenth century that "It is especially in the conduct of their foreign relations that democracies appear to be decidedly inferior to other governments." With that observation in mind, our task is to achieve the firm sense of purpose, readiness, steadiness, and strength that is indispensable for effective and timely foreign policy decision-making. Our American political community and Israel's political community must resist the temptation of partisan politics and institutional rivalry as we develop the consensus adequate to meet the challenge of de Tocqueville's criticism.

My friends, there are troubling differences within the American Jewish community and within the Jewish community in Israel. These are understandable and natural for a free and thoughtful people. But our differences are minimal in the face of our agreements. With our experience, we know how to identify a victim. We know better than the media that Israel is the "victim." In the strategic struggle, Israel, the victim, is in the right! In the struggle for justice, Israel is in the right! In the struggle and yearning for peace, Israel is in the right! Let us be unified in that understanding. Israel needs more than airplanes and tanks. Israel also needs the unity and understanding of the American Jewish community behind it. That is up to us.

Israel is still struggling to be a free state, one that it has every moral and legal right to be under the UN Charter. It is still struggling to be free from attack on its territory. It still faces a host of declared enemies who continue to advocate its annihilation. Our goal as Jews, our goal as Americans, our country's goal as a nation dedicated to peace with dignity is to help Israel achieve its right under the Charter of the United Nations, a right granted to all states, to be free within safe and secure borders from the use of force or the threat of the use of force against its territory or independence. As Jews and as Americans we must not permit ourselves to be distracted from achieving that goal.

Now a final word as Americans. Our country is today the oldest democracy in the world. Our forefathers said that "America is the last great hope of mankind." It still is! Our political values have helped us build the most dynamic and open society in recorded history, a source of inspiration to most of the world. It is a promise of a better tomorrow for the hundreds of millions of people who have never known the gifts of human freedom. The future lies with liberty, human dignity, and democracy. To preserve and expand these values, the fulfillment of our religious ethic, is our special responsibility. We should look upon it as an exciting opportunity.

Thank you.

**SUBSCRIBE TO
VITAL SPEECHES**

\$30.00 per year

Send subscription to

CITY NEWS PUBLISHING COMPANY, PO Box 1247, Mount Pleasant, S.C. 29465
Telephone 803-881-8733

Copyright © 2003 EBSCO Publishing